



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,049	07/09/2001	Keiichi Shimizu	210101US2	3900
22850	7590	03/10/2005	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			DANIEL JR, WILLIE J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2686	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/900,049

Applicant(s)

SHIMIZU ET AL.

Examiner

Willie J. Daniel, Jr.

Art Unit

2686

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 02.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Marsha D. Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISOR EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 18 February 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's arguments as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the comments in this section and Final Action mailed 18 February 2004).

Regarding Applicant's arguments on pg. 3, paragraph 3, lines 1-7 "Chen fails to disclose applicants' claimed step of the previous foreign agent requesting the new foreign detects to agent-advertise to the mobile terminal equipment when the previous foreign agent detects the start of handoff", Examiner respectfully disagrees. Chen discloses as stated in the amended claim 1 "when detecting the start of a handoff, said previous foreign agent (BS1) requesting said new foreign agent (BS2) to agent-advertise to said mobile terminal equipment (MH) (see pg. 442, left col., lines 28-34,47-53; pg. 442, right col., lines 9-13; Fig. 6), where the handoff is detected due to conditions such as low signal strength in which the serving BS1 informs the candidate BS2 of the move from one cell to another cell in which the agent-advertise would be inherent. The served BS1 initiates communication to the candidate BS2 when the mobile host is about to move (i.e., handoff) in the direction of the candidate BS2 in which the candidate BS2 provides communication with the mobile host. Also, the Examiner suggest the applicant to review the rejection of Claim 1 in the Final Action mailed 18 February 2004.

Examiner requests applicant to provide page(s) and line(s) of the amended instant application that clearly defines the "agent-advertise".

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding Applicant's arguments of Claims 13-14 on pg. 3, paragraph 3, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth above.